

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/613,362	MATSUMOTO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Michael I Poe	1732	

**All Participants:**

(1) Michael I Poe (Examiner).

(2) Joseph Carrier (Applicant's attorney).

**Status of Application:** Amended (After Non-Final Rejection)

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 12 November 2004

**Time:** 14:30

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
*None specifically*

Claims discussed:  
 1-26

Prior art documents discussed:  
*None specifically*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called the applicant's attorney to discuss proposed amendments that were necessary to place the application in condition for allowance. Although the examiner indicated that the applicant's arguments with regard to the claims (see especially the arguments with regard to originally presented claim 8) were persuasive, the examiner further indicated that the claims were not in condition for allowance due to the presence of non-elected claims. As such, the examiner proposed canceling non-elected claims 14-25 drawn to the invention of the slip casting mold and rejoining non-elected species claims 6, 7 and 10 of the elected method. The examiner further indicated that the title did not accurately reflect the allowable invention. As such, the examiner proposed amending the title to: "METHOD OF MANUFACTURING AN OPEN POROUS BODY FOR USE IN A SLIP CASTING MOLD". The applicant's attorney approved these proposed changes and authorized the examiner to proceed with the agreed-upon changes via Examiner's Amendment.